

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION**

Angela Ruth Doctor,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No.: 0:15-cv-00265-JMC
)	
v.)	ORDER AND OPINION
)	
The City of Rock Hill; Chris Watts; Sarah)	
Blair; Robert N. Jenkins,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Angela Doctor (“Plaintiff”) brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that she was illegally searched during a traffic stop in violation of the Fourth Amendment. (ECF No. 1-1.) Further, Plaintiff asserts claims of negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and assault and battery against Defendants. (*Id.*) Plaintiff seeks compensatory and punitive damages, as well as attorney’s fees. (ECF No. 1-1 at 8). This matter is before the court on Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 16.) Plaintiff opposes Defendants’ motion. (ECF No. 20.)

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., the matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shiva Hodges for a Report and Recommendation. On July 19, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending the court grant Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 22). The Report sets forth the relevant facts and legal standards, which this court incorporates herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge's Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Matthews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). This court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation, or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1). Objections to a Report and Recommendation must specifically identify portions of the Report and the basis for those objections. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). "[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 316 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

Plaintiff was advised of her right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 22 at 9). Plaintiff was required to file objections by August 5, 2016. To date, Plaintiff has not filed any objections to the Report. Accordingly, this court has reviewed the Report of the Magistrate Judge and does not find clear error.

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court finds the Report provides an accurate summary of the facts and law. The court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 22). Accordingly, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 16) is **GRANTED**. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's action (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "J. Michelle Childs". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

United States District Judge

August 8, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina